

Sent: 6/20/2019 9:44:25 PM

Comments on proposed technical package from R8 regulators:

CO

- Keep semi-annual and quarterly LDAR for wellpads and compressor stations respectively
- Against using BOE production as threshold to reduce monitoring frequency – will be hard to link with CO's approach of VOC threshold
- Maintain the 'no detectable emissions' standard for tank thief hatches as part of the closed vent system
- Improve clarity on 'maximum average daily throughput' for first 30-days for determining tank applicability (for facilities downstream of wellpads, use permits to determine applicability of NSPS OOOOa)
- The potential emissions of storage vessels in parallel or in series, should be determined based on the production to the tank battery and not the production divided by the number of storage vessels (clarify the term tank battery to mean "any fixed roof storage vessel or series of storage vessels that are manifolded together via liquid line." Colorado uses a similar concept in Colorado's definition of "storage tank.")
- Appreciates CO being deemed an equivalent program for LDAR. But, EPA should allow compliance with an incorporated state program's reporting provisions in lieu of the NSPS OOOOa fugitive emissions reporting requirements
- Supports the flexibility provided by EPA's proposed AMEL revisions to the demonstration data requirements, including the option to supplement field data with modeling analyses, test data, or other documentation. The Division suggests that EPA revise the NSPS OOOOa AMEL process to allow owners or operators to apply for the use of an AMEL in Colorado through Colorado's alternative monitoring application and review process.

ND

- Support the use of a sliding scale where companies must achieve a certain level of compliance before moving from semi-annual LDAR to less frequent.
- Agrees with EPA's statements: "...the increase in production rate requires an increase to either the operating pressure and/or the duration or frequency of flow event." and "increased production throughput to storage vessels increases the flash emissions at those storage vessels."
- Agrees with the clarified definition that a modification of a tank battery occurs when "...production from a new, hydraulically fractured, or hydraulically refractured well is sent to an existing separate tank battery..."
- Agrees with EPA that the PE requirement is burdensome to industry and that staff engineers are likely more knowledgeable about the company's site designs, equipment, and operations for CVS and pneumatic pumps
- Agrees with EPA's assertion regarding operations (i.e. no leaks) and that thief hatches on controlled storage vessels should not be subject to a delay of repair.

WY

- Against using BOE production as threshold to reduce monitoring frequency – use a VOC threshold (seemed to misunderstand how BOE is calculated)
- LDAR monitoring at CSs should start at semi-annual (or quarterly as is currently), and then move to annual (or semi-annual) if no leaks found in two or more successive surveys
- Supports allowing closed vent system design to be certified by PE or in-house engineer.
- Welcomes emerging technology for fugitive emissions monitoring AMEL.
- LDAR State plans - fugitive emission plans in WY are case specific (BACT analysis) to each well site, compressor station, and company. To develop an State-AMEL, which could be incorporated into the proposed OOOOa revisions, would be resource intensive - request EPA take into account that BACT determinations will likely exceed the EPA's threshold for AMEL. EPA should allow industry to follow their case-specific plans in lieu of the proposed fugitive emissions monitoring in the proposed rule.

- Agrees with the expansion of the technical infeasibility provision for pneumatic pumps where only a high-pressure flare on site.

Ute Tribe

- As a sovereign government and co-regulator of air quality in the Uintah Basin, the Tribe expects the EPA to work with the Tribe on a government-to-government basis. The EPA must ensure an equal playing field in its implementation of this proposed rule and other regulations that apply on our Tribal lands. Restrictions that apply to tribal lands cannot exceed those on state or federal lands, because this will drive development off the reservation. Industry operations cross these boundaries and our partners' operation plans cannot carve out tribal land from overall project development.
- EPA must finalize the amendments to the National Federal Implementation Plan for Indian Country and work with the Tribe to complete the Reservation-specific Federal Implementation Plan.

Cindy Beeler

US EPA Region 8

Tel: 303-312-6204

Beeler.Cindy@epa.gov



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail, including all attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipients and may contain Confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.